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RESUMO
A evolução cíclica dos pronomes românicos de identidade (ex.: însuși e același) fornece dados interessantes para documentar o impacto de fatores pragmáticos na mudança linguística, uma vez que ela mostra como palavras que trazem implicaturas convencionais semelhantes podem se tornar alternativas adequadas para substituir itens homófonos.

ABSTRACT
The cyclic evolution of the Romanian pronouns of identity (e.g. însuși “self” and același “same”) provides interesting data for documenting the impact of pragmatic factors upon the language change, since it shows how words carrying similar conventional implicatures can become suitable alternates for replacing homophonous items.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE
Implicatura convencional, co-referencialidade, expectativa, morfema ligado, função pragmática, pronome: - enfático, - interrogativo, - pessoal, - possessivo, - reflexivo; - de identidade; tópico, topicalização.

KEY WORDS
The evolution of Lat. *sibi* “REFL-DAT” in Romanian provides interesting data on the cliticization of a full word and its transformation into a bound morpheme. It also shows how homonymic clashes can contribute to the loss of an entire morphemic paradigm and how, thanks to shared pragmatic functions, new alternates may acquire the possibility of carrying the same conventional implicature as the lost items. The development in question can be summarized as follows:

Stage I. In Old Romanian (--16th c. -- 18th c.) *și*, the reflex of Lat. *sibi* “REFL-DAT”, becomes an enclitic bound morpheme expressing “coreferentiality”. Attached to personal pronouns and to deictic expressions (pronouns and adverbials), -*și* served to develop an entire paradigm of means denying an expected non-coreferentiality. After quantifiers and indefinite pronouns it became even a mere intensifier.

Stage II (18thc.--): The bound morpheme -*și* is restricted to a reduced number of combinations, namely the emphatic pronoun însuși “self”, the pronoun of identity același “same”, and the temporal adverbials atunciși (now.self), atunci (then.self) “right away”. It is very likely that this limited distribution is due mainly to the ambiguity created by its occurrence in similar contexts to its homophonous possessive dative. The pronoun însuși (a compound of the preposition în, întru “in(to)” + *isu* (cf. Lat. *ipsu* “self, same, he”) + -*și*), becomes the standard expression of “self”.

Stage III (19th c. --): The bound morpheme –și is no longer productive. The emphatic pronoun însuși “self” becomes unpopular due to its highly irregular morphology and syntactic constraints. Consequently, other means of expressing an unexpected identity such as singur “alone” or chiar “(it is) clear (that P)” tend to replace it thanks to their shared pragmatic values of denial.

1. Markers of an unexpected identity
1.1 The bound morpheme –și and the emphatic pronouns

In Old Romanian (16thc. -18thc.) *și* (< Lat. *sibi* “REFL-DAT”),
with its graphic variants ş, şû, şî, became an enclitic marker of coreferentiality. The Latin reflexive dative sibi was characterized by two features that could predict its further evolution, namely: (i) as a reflexive, it marked the fact that the same referent was assigned two Roles in the given event (one Role being encoded as the syntactic subject in most cases) and (ii) as a dative, it referred mainly to the Experiencer / Beneficiary and was pragmatically exploited in various ways. According to Ernout & Thomas (1972: 184), the Latin reflexive still preserves its etymological meaning of “oneself” (cf. Fr. “soi-même”). Flobert (1975: 387-388) defines the Latin reflexive pronoun as expressions of a high degree of voluntarism (“une volonté délibérée de soi sur soi”). Thanks to this value it can co-occur even with the middle (i.e. the forms in –r, so-called deponents, middle or passive forms), which also presupposes the fact that the referent of the subject is both the doer and the undergoer (in Flobert’s words, the form in -r represents a “dédoublement du sujet tout à la fois agissant et agi” – see (1)).

(1) Me nunc commoror (Plaut, Ps.: 1131)
    me-ACC now refrain.I-MID
    “as for me, I now refrain [myself]”.

Generally speaking, the dative case on its own carries a special pragmatic connotation, since it points to the most salient constituent after the Agent. As Hymann & Zimmer (1976: 189-212) have pointed out, dative is more marked as to topicalization and focalization processes than any other oblique case. In Givón’s (1984: 139-141) topicalization hierarchy, the semantic role Dative (usually expressed by the dative morphological case) comes immediately after the Agent as the most likely candidate for the topic when the Agent is not specified. This pragmatic connotation must have also contributed to the reinterpretation of the reflexive -şî as a preferred means for reinforcing the emphatic value of the Old
Romanian personal and demonstrative pronouns, first in the dative and then in the accusative.

In Old Romanian (16th c.) the bound morpheme –și (cf. Lat. sibi “self: DAT”) could be attached to all kinds of pronouns: personal (luiș “of/to himself”, lorusi “of/to themselves”, mineși “myself”, tineși “yourself”, noiiși “ourselves”, voisi “yourselves”), demonstratives (același “that.self”, i.e. “same”), and deictic adverbs (e.g. acusi “now.self”, i.e. “immediately”, etc.). All these forms co-occur synchronically in the Romanian older texts, so the stages of the spread of –și as a marker of coreferentiality have to be reconstructed. Within the framework of the extended model of prototypical semantics, it is possible to reconstruct diachronic semantic links on the basis of the synchronic relations between synonymous lexemes (see Kleiber, 1990: 180-181; Geeraerts, 1987). In our opinion, the only possible reasonable scenario for the evolution of Lat. sibi in Romanian should present the following sequencing:

First of all, –și (și, șu) occurred after the dative lui (cf. Vulg.Lat. *illui – Cl. Lat. illi “to him”) to express coreferentiality with the subject in contexts where lui alone could be ambiguous. As (2) shows, after a noun, lui could refer to either (i) two coreferential arguments of the same predicate or (ii) two coreferential arguments of different predicates.

(2) tremease elu la satului lui₁ să pască porcii, sent him to village his to take.care.of pigs
[...] și nemica nu deade lui₂ (CÎ:21)
[...] and nothing not gave him:DAT
“he sent him to his village to take care of the pigs [...] and gave him nothing”.

In (2) lui₂ refers to an indirect object previously identified (the prodigal son) and not to the subject of deade “gave” [the landlord]. But lui₁ (in satului lui “his village”) could be decoded as being coreferential with the subject of tremease “he sent” only thanks to the
knowledge of the information provided by the whole co-text of the parable. The model for the spread of -și from dative to possessives must have been offered by the stressed personal pronoun in the dative (lui “of/to him”), which could be either an indirect object or an attribute. This double function of lui has been favored by the persistence of the Latin construction called dativus adnominalis in Old Romanian (see (3)); cf. Fr. fils à papa lit. “son to papa”, i.e. “daddy’s boy”.

(3) pentru moarte lui Mihai vodă (Costin: 83)
for death he-DAT Mihai king
“for King’s Michael’s death”.

In (4) the addition of –și clearly disambiguates the “possessive” lui. The compound luișu refers unambiguously to the same person as the subject:

(4) toate ispravele părea -i -se
all great.things.the seemed-IMPF him:DAT REFL-ACC
că cu puterea luișu că le- au isprăvitu
that with might-the his.REFL that them hashe achieved.
“he thinks that he has achieved great things by his own might” (CÎ:15).

But, as shown by (5), the reflexive possessive adjective său “his-MASC.SG” (cf. Lat. suus) has in fact the same function of signaling co-referentiality:

(5) ori-carele n- are dragoste cătră fratele său (Înv:513)
whoever not has love for brother his
“whoever does not have love for his brother”.

The difference between luiși and the reflexive adjective său rests on the pragmatic level: as it will be demonstrated below, the
compounds with –și (including luiși) deny an expected non-coreferentiality, whereas the reflexive adjective său does not.

Secondly, the dative compounds offered the model for the spread of –și as a marker of coreferentiality to the accusative of the 3rd person (eluși “himself-ACC” (see (7)), eiși “themselves-ACC” (Înv: 508), and even to other persons: mineși “myself-ACC” (Înv: 509), tineși “yourself-ACC”, noși “ourselves-ACC” (CÎ:18) — see Densusianu 1961.II: 118-119). The fact that a dative was preferred over the accusative for attributing the pragmatic function of emphasis to personal pronouns is therefore due to both a syntactic factor and its pragmatic functions.

The pronominal compounds with –și may refer to a prominent topical constituent that is not the subject of the same clause. In (6), for example, luiși marks the unexpected coreferentiality with the topical Experiencer – i “him-DAT” (functioning as an indirect object):

(6) nu -i vine luiși aciașu foamea (CÎ: 26)
not him-DAT comes him-ACC: self right away hunger:the
“This he himself does not feel hungry right away”.

The compound forms with –și co-occur frequently with the reflexive pronoun in order to confirm the identity in question, as an emphatic pronoun:

(7) iaste nedereptu de carele e prinsu de vreo boală
is:it wrong for who:the is caught by any sickness
să se junghe eluși (CÎ: 23)
that REFL-ACC stab him.REFL
“It is wrong for the one who falls sick to stab himself”.

According to the maxim of quantity, the shorter utterance (8) would have conveyed the same idea of stabbing, but without the implicature that “according to the ethical principles of the community in question, one is not supposed to do so”.
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(8)  să  se  junghe
that  REFL-ACC stabs-he
“that he stabs himself”.

As I hope to have demonstrated elsewhere (see Manoliu 1994: 192-194), the emphatic pronouns carry the conventional implicature that denies an expectation that the predicate in question applies to non-coreferential arguments. In symbolic logic terms, the expectation denied in (7) may be formulated as follows:

\[ \text{EXP}_7: \exists x \exists y (V_{(x, y)}) \cdot \sim (x \equiv y), \]

where \( \exists \) is the existential quantifier “there is a…”; \( x \) would represent the first argument of the predicate “to stab”, the Agent; \( y \) represents the second argument of the predicate “to stab”, the Patient, whereas the symbol \( \sim \) represents the denial “it is not true that”. In other words, there is an Agent \( x \) and there is a Patient \( y \), and the predicate “kills” applies to \( x \), but it is not true that \( x \) is co-referential with \( y \), so the predicate does not apply to two arguments which refer to the same person as both Agent and Patient simultaneously. The meaning asserted by (7) is:

\[ \text{S}_7: \exists x \exists y (V_{(x, y)}) \cdot \sim (\sim (x \equiv y)), \]

i.e. “there is an \( x \) (the Agent) and a \( y \) (the Patient) and it is not true that the predicate ‘to stab’ does not apply to \( x \) as both the Agent and the Patient at the same time.” In brief, the expressions of “self” carry the conventional implicature that denies the fact that the predicate applies to two non-coreferential arguments. So it forcefully confirms the coreferentiality of two arguments of the same predicate. In our opinion, this is the reason behind the label ‘pronouns of reinforcement’. In (9), the stressed reflexive accusative \( sineși \) (\( = sine \ “him/herself” \ + -și \)) doubles the first reflexive \( se \)
(direct object), as a strongly emphatic pronoun:

(9) carei  se  derepteașă  de  sineși
who-PL  REFL-ACC  consider.righteous  of  self-ACC.self
și  ocănașc  pre  ceia  ce  greșescu  (CÎ: 14)
and  scolds  ACC  those  who  sin.
“those  who  think  of  themselves  they  are  righteous  and  scold  those  who  sin”.

In (10), -și is added even to the possessive adjective săi “his/her/their”; compare (5) and (10):

(10) iară  ei  întoarseră  -se  întru  ai  săși  (CV:254)
and  they  went.back  REFL-ACC  to  those/of  REFL-PL.REFL-DAT
“and  they  went  back  to  theirs  (=  to  their  people)”.

1.2 -și and  the  identity  pronoun  “same”

With  demonstratives, -și has  a  different  function,  namely  it serves  to  express  the  meaning  of  “same”. In  order  to  explain  this change, it  is  necessary  to  account  for  the  difference  between  “same”  and  “self”  in pragmatic  terms.  Let  us  thus  analyze  the utterance (11):

(11) s’  au  î  gre itu,  în  acelașu  ceasu  de
if  has.he  even  sinned,  in  same  hour  of
acelea  păcate  se-  au  și  pocăitu  …  (CÎ: 18)
those  sins  REFL  has.he  also  repented
“even  if  he  sinned,  he  also  repented  of  his  sins  within  the  same hour  (right  away)”.

The  expectation  of  (11)  is  that  one  does  not  sin  and  repent  so quickly.  In  brief,

\[ \text{EXP}_{11}: \exists x \text{“he”} \exists y \text{“hour}_1 \text{”} (V \text{sin}_{(x,y)}). \exists x \exists z \text{“hour}_2 \text{”} (V \text{repent}_{(x,z)}). \sim (y \equiv z). \]
The asserted meaning of (11) is thus:

\[ S_{11}: \exists x \text{"he"} \exists y \text{"hour\textsubscript{1}"} (V\textsubscript{sin} (x, y)) . \exists x \exists z \text{"hour\textsubscript{2}"} (V\textsubscript{repent} (x, z)) . \sim (\sim (y \equiv z)). \]

In other words, \textit{același} “same” denies the expectation that the referent provided by the world of common beliefs for the argument \( y \) of the first predicate (“\textit{sin}”) is not identical with the argument \( z \) of the second predicate (\textit{repent}) and asserts that they are identical.

The difference between “self” and “same” may be thus expressed in pragmatic terms as follows: “self” confirms ‘the identity between two arguments of the \textit{same predicate\textsubscript{1}}’, whereas “same” confirms ‘the identity between the arguments of \textit{different predicates}’.

The reinterpretation of the compound of the distal demonstrative + \textit{-și} as “same” was favored by the following features of the two components. The value of ‘coreferentiality’ brought in by \textit{-și} is conjugated with the focus on the ‘novelty of the referent and/or of the predication’ expressed by the demonstrative. As Kleiber (1992: 623), for example, emphasizes:

\[ Si \text{ un locuteur utilise une expression indexicale, c-est-à dire une expression qui déclenche une procédure de répérage spatio-temporel, c'est qu'il juge que son interlocuteur n'a pas encore le référent à l'esprit (cas du référent nouveau) ou qu'il entend le lui faire découvrir sous un aspect nouveau (dans l'hypothèse où le référent est déjà connu). } \]

In brief, the demonstratives are strong signals of inviting the addressee to identify the referent as a new entity or as an already known entity to which a new predicate applies. In other words, in the presence of a demonstrative, the \textit{new predicate} may apply either to (a) an argument coreferential with an argument of a previous predicate or (b) a new referent (when the demonstrative is used as an indexical). Such a context is incompatible with the idea of ‘coreferential arguments of the \textit{same predicate}'\textsubscript{1}. It is then explicable why the addition of \textit{-și} (confirming coreferentiality) to a
demonstrative (focusing on the novelty of the predicate) will activate meaning (a) and will result in the interpretation of the whole compound as the expression of “same”, which, as already shown, confirms the fact that the argument of one predicate is coreferential with the argument of another predicate. It is perhaps interesting to recall at this point the fact that Lat. *ipse* “self” was also reinterpreted as “same” when co-occurring with demonstratives (see 2.2.1 below). The invariant pragmatic function shared by both “self” and “same” may be defined as “the denial of an expected non-coreferentiality”.

When co-occurring with the proximity demonstrative (as in *acestași*), -și is just an additional marker intensifying the cataphoric value of *acest* “this”:

(12) Déciia pacea o au legat într- *acestași* chip,

Then peace.the it-FEM/ACC have made in this.REFL way

*ca să-i fie într-agiutoriu înpotrivă fiecăruni vrâmas*… (Ureche: 123).

to help each other against every enemy.”

“The then they made peace in this [very] way (= on the following understanding): to help each other against their enemies”.

When -și(ă) is combined with temporal deictic adverbials, the confirmation of ‘identity between two moments’ is reinterpreted as ‘immediateness’ (short span of time between successive events): e.g. *acmușă* “now.REFL” (13); *atunçeș* “then.REFL” (14).

(13) ă vei *acmușă* muri (Frag. Tod.:31)

cause will.you now.REFL die

“because you soon will die”.

(14) șî fu *atunçeș* chemat Vasilie (Moxa:183)

and was then.REFL called Vasile

“and Vasile was called right away”.
The spatial deictic *aci* “here” combined with –și ends up by also expressing “immediateness”.

(15) Și *aci*și închiseră ușile cerîndu elu se- lu uigă. (CV: 261)
And here.INTENS locked doors asking him-ACC that him-ACC kill- SUBJ
“And they locked the doors right away asking [them] to kill him”.

Combined with iară “again” as in iarăși “again (and again)”, -și reinforces the meaning of ‘repetition’, because iară alone was on its way of becoming a weak adversative conjunction (comp. (10) above and (16) below).

(16) În deșertu mă laudu, și, ca un mândru, iarăși
“In vain myself praise.I, and, as, a haughty [man],” again.self
in deșertu mă laudu! (CI: 14)
in vain myself praise.I!”
“In vain I praise myself, and, as, a haughty [man], I praise myself time and again”.

1.3. –Și as an intensifier

When -și is attached to other classes of constituents with no anaphoric function, its pragmatic interpretation as a marker of confirmation is converted into “increase in assertiveness”. In brief, the confirmation marker -și becomes an intensifier.

(i) As such, -și may follow an indefinite/interrogative pronoun: cineși “whoever”, cinreși, cinreșci “whoever”; cinevași “somebody”, careși “each [of them]”, oareși-care “any [one]”.

(17) cineș va osândi, sine […] vinovatu se face,
who-self will condemn, himself guilty REFL makes
să va avea și lucrure bune multe. (CI: 18)
if would have even deeds good many
“whoever will condemn, condemns himself […], even if he has
done good deeds.”

(ii) It may also follow an indefinite quantifier: integral: \textit{totuľuş} “whole”; partitive: \textit{cituşi} [\textit{de puţin}]“however [little]”, or an ordinal numeral: \textit{întiiăşi/dintiiăşi} “the very first [time], from the beginning”.

\textbf{(18)} \textit{acela iaste cu totuľuş totu cu Dumnezeu} that one is entire.INTENS entirely with God “that one is entirely with God” (Înv.:513)

\textbf{(19)} \textit{Aşijderea, întiiăşi dată au trimis de au luat blagoslovenie} In.the.same.way, first time has sent for has taken blessing \textit{de la patriarhii Răsăritului} (Ureche:81) from patriarchs.the East.the-GEN “In the same way, he [very] first sent to get a blessing from the patriarchs of the East”.

\textbf{2. Stage II (\text{--18}^{\text{th}}\text{c.})}: the decay of the bound morpheme \textit{–şi}

During the period in question the bound morpheme \textit{–şi} becomes restricted to a reduced number of combinations. This reduction is probably due to the following factors:

a. homonymy with its semi-cliticized reflexive variant \textit{şi(ţ/î)} expressing coreferentiality with the subject, as an indirect object of either the “beneficiary” or the “whole/possessor” (with both alienable and inalienable possessions). The contexts in which the reflexive possessive \textit{–şi(ţ/î)} occurred after nouns constituted a favorable position in which confusions between the possessive and the emphatic \textit{–şi} could arise (see (23) below)

b. other expressions acquire the conventional implicatures carried by the compounds of \textit{–şi}, and hence competition between forms (for example, the pronoun \textit{însuşi} “himself ”, as
an alternate noun modifier, the adjectival singur “alone”, the adverbial: chiar “even”, etc.).

Let us examine even briefly these concurrent factors.

2.1 SIBI proper: Rom. reflexive dative pronouns

The reflexes of the reflexive dative pronoun Lat. sibi, namely și, (ș, și), are first and foremost clitics that could be attached to all kinds of words ending in a vowel. In (20), for example, it is attached to the verb and has the function of an indirect object co-referential with the subject:

(20) vine- șu întru minte (CÎ: 21)

comes self-DAT into mind

“he comes to his senses”.

The use of the semi-cliticized reflexive variant as the ‘dative of the Whole/Possessor/Beneficiary’ constitutes another factor that undermined the use of the bound morpheme -și as a means of reinforcing the pragmatic functions of personal pronouns and deictics. As in other Romance languages, the reflexive of the “whole” could be used in conjunction with the accusative of the parts of the body 4:

(21) cei ce -ș tunseră capetele (CV:230).

those who self-DAT shaved heads.the

“those who shaved their heads”.

But the dative reflexive can also be used for the Beneficiary/Possessor of an alienable possession even when not in contact with the human body:

(22) adura- și cărțile (CV:234).

collected-he self-DAT books.the

“he collected his books”.
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In no Romanian text does the emphatic –și (șu) occur after a noun, because, on the one hand, the noun does not express coreferentiality by itself and, on the other, it would be in competition with its reflexive homophone expressing Beneficiary/Possessor, as shown by (23) and (24).

(23) pre voe -șu (CÎ: 23)
    on will REFL-DAT
    “on his own will” i.e. “knowingly”

(24) duse în casa -ș (Moxa: 183)
    took in houseREFL-DAT
    “he took [him] to his house”.

Moreover the reflexive indirect object și/u could also be attached to the subject personal pronoun elu “he”. The contracted form elu-șu then becomes homophonous with the emphatic pronoun in the accusative. Compare (25) below and (7) above:

(25) elu-șu aduse aminte (CÎ: 27.)
    he REFL-DAT brought to.mind
    “he remembered”.

2.2. Lat. IPE - Rom. însuși, as an alternate reinforcement pronoun

2.2.1 Lat. IPSE

According to Ernout & Thomas (1972:189), ipse “est proprement un intensif, qui s’emploie avec une idée d’opposition latente” (is an intensive proper that is used with an idea of latent opposition). In other words, as any emphatic pronoun, ipse may be defined as a signal of “unexpected coreferentiality of two arguments of the same predicate” 5. Let us consider the following example:
(26) nuntiare iubent regi uelle ipsos ad
inform ordered king-DAT want-INF themselves-ACC to
eum mandata perferre (Curtius: 7.8,8).
him message deliver

“[The ambassadors] ordered that the king be informed that they wanted to deliver the message to him personally”.

In (27) the use of ipsos (instead of the mere reflexive accusative se) in the ‘accusative + infinitive’ construction implies that the ambassadors might have suspected that somebody did not want to let them deliver their message in person. An even more interesting example of the role of ipse in denying an expected non-coreferentiality is provided by (28), where ipsae co-occurs with a reflexive pronoun:

(28) Valvae [...] se ipsae aperuerunt (Cicero, Div. 1)
Doors REFL-ACC themselves opened
“The doors opened by themselves”.

The fact that the doors opened by themselves may not have been considered as an usual phenomenon in the everyday Roman life. According to the maxim of quantity, if such an event would have met the common beliefs, the utterance valvae se aperuerunt “the doors opened” would have been the normal choice. But in the given cultural context, characterized by the common belief that an external force has to act for opening doors, ipse is a sign of denying the expectation provided by the shared knowledge of a historically determined linguistic community. When combined with other demonstrative pronouns (hic ipse, iste ipse, ille ipse), ipse is virtually synonymous with idem (according to Ernout & Thomas (1972: 191) in such contexts “ipse se rapprochait de idem”). In V. Lat. ipse alone could also carry the conversational implicature of idem “same” as shown by the following utterance:
(29) **non ipsa parte exire habebamus qua intrueramus** (Aeth., A. 5)

not same side go-INF had.to.we which-ABL went.in.we.

“we did not have to go out the same way we went in”.

In Vulgar Latin, *ipse* started to lose its pragmatic value of “confirming an unexpected coreferentiality”, as shown by its co-occurrence with other “identity markers” such as -met: e.g. *egomet ipse* “I.and.nobody.else” + “self” or *metipse* “self.self”; cf. the resulting forms in Romance languages: Fr. *même* “self, same, even”, Sp. *mismo* “same”, Pg. *mesmo*, It. *medesimo* “same, self”.

In spoken Latin *ipse* could replace other demonstratives such as *iste* or *hic* as shown by the corresponding Romance demonstratives: O. Sp. *eje*, Occ. *eis*, O.Pg. *eiso*, Sp. *ese*, Pg. *esse* “this-2nd” Aromanian *nîs*, *năs*, Istroromanian *âns* “this” (Pușcariu 1957 s.v. 870). In some areas it then became a personal pronoun (cf. It. *essi* “they”), then a focalizer pointing to a salient constituent (see (30)) and even a definite article (cf. Sard. *su* “the”)  

(30) **Sedens in eadem spelunca, quae in ipsa ecclesia est** (Aeth,123)

Sitting in the very cave, which in that church is

“Sitting in the very cave, which is in the church (we mentioned above)”.

### 2.2.2 The Romanian emphatic pronoun *însuși*

As a consequence of the loss of its illocutionary force of confirming an unexpected identity, the Romanian pronoun *însu* (deriving from ?*în* + *ipsu*) developed into a mere personal pronoun whose anaphoric function was reinforced by the addition of the article –*îl* (*<* Lat. *ille*) as in *însul* (see (31)) and the compound *dînsul* (de “from”+ *însul* (see (32))). However its counterpart originating in the demonstrative *ille* “that” took over its functions as in most of the Romance languages, as shown by the fact that already in Old Romanian, *însu* had a very limited distribution. It could occur mainly in combination with a preposition: *într-însu* “in it-MASC” (CV: 248);
**intr-însa** “in it.the-FEM” (Ureche: 94); **pre însul** “on him.the” (Ureche:95); **de înse** “of them-FEM.PL”(Ureche:83), **dentru-însa** “from it.the-FEM.SG”(Ureche:121); cf. Cont. Rom. **într-însul** “in it/him.the-MASC” and **intr-însa** “in it/her.the-FEM. 7

(31) **dzise cătr-înșii** (CV 246)  
said.he to them-PL.the-PL  
“he said to them”.

(32) **cu dinșii**  
with prep.them-PL.the-PL was  
“with them was…”

The reflexive –și was a welcome addition to the pronoun însu for expressing the confirmation of “an unexpected coreferentiality of the arguments of the same predicate”. In Old Romanian, the emphatic însuși alone could function as a pronoun (see 33), which is unacceptable in modern Romanian (see the corresponding cont. Rom. expression in (34)):

(33) **e însuş intră intru gloaţă** (CV: 230 )  
and he.self entered into crowd  
“and he himself went to join the crowd”.

(34) **și el însuşî intră în mulțime**  
and he himself entered into crowd  
“and he himself went to join the crowd”.

In (35) însuşă follows a demonstrative subject:

(35) **Acesta amu însuşă știe** (CÎ: 23)  
This-one now he.self knows  
“This one, you see, knows by himself”.
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As an adjective it could also precede its head noun (36).

(36) de-abiia au scăpat însuși crainul spre ţara sa (Ureche: 116)

hardly has escaped he.self king.the towards land.the his
“even the king hardly escaped to his land”.

It could also double a personal pronoun:

(37) voi vedeți însivă (CV:229)

you see.you yourselves
“you see by yourselves”.

As has been pointed above, in Old Romanian texts, însuși seems to have been the only possible candidate after nouns, since the enclitic –și(ũ/i) had the function of a possessive dative (see (23) and (24) above). From nouns, însuși must have spread to pronouns, to eliminate also the possible confusion with the contracted form elu-șă “he + to.himself” (see (25) above).

3. Stage III: Modern Romanian
3.1. A new paradigm of identity

The rich paradigm of markers of a denied expected non-coreferentiality was reduced to the following combinations, which are also current in contemporary Romanian: același “same” (38) and însuși “self”” (39, 40):

(38) îmi spune mereu același lucru

me.DAT tells.he time and again same thing
“he tells me the same thing time and again”.

(39) Întrebarea lui, care nu avea decât un răspuns, […], m-a enervat mai mult

His question, which had no answer […] , infuriated me even more
decât așteptarea însăși  și n-am răspuns (CP:17)

than waiting. the itself-FEM.SG and not-have answered

“His question, which had no answer, […], infuriated me even more than the waiting in itself and I did not answer”.

(40) Dar imediat îmi era rușine de mine însămi (CP:22)

But immediately me-DAT was shame of me-ACC myself-FEM

“But immediately I was ashamed of myself”.

3.2 Stage IV (18th c. --): The decay of the emphatic pronouns

If același is still the sole form for “(the) same” (but see Manoliu 1987:421-424 for the tendency for it to be replaced by tot “also” + acela “that”), însuși “self” has a similar fate as its precursors. It becomes vulnerable due to two factors: (a) morphological complexity: it has a highly irregular inflexion which has no match in any other nominal paradigm: (i) its gender and number are marked by a change in the stem vowel: -u/ă/i/e-; (ii) its gender agreement is governed by the gender of the referent in the 1st and 2nd persons and by the head noun in the 3rd person; (iii) moreover, the stress falls on the first syllable and, consequently, the complex final markers are unstressed (see the table of its inflexion in (41)) and (b) syntactic restrictions (for example, însuși cannot occur after a noun in the genitive (see (42)).

(41) Sg. Pl.

1st pers însuși însăși însăși însăși
2nd pers. însuți însăți însivă
3rd pers. însuși însăși însiși însesi

(42) șif- a vândut casa lui ** însuși / sa proprie

self-DAT has sold house he-GEN himself / his own

“He sold his own house.”
As shown by (42), when determining a noun, însuși is replaced by a complex construction namely: reflexive possessive (său/sa “his/her”) + the adjective propriu “own”.

Confusions between these forms occur rather frequently in both Old and contemporary Romanian: see O. Rom. (43), where the 3rd person replaces însumi, and (44), where it replaces însuți (in Gheție1997: 127), or Cont. Rom.(45), where the singular form replaces the plural înseși (see Iordan et al.1967:133).

(43) eu însiș înșiș înșiș înșiș înșiș știu, CV, 21
    I self-3rd.PL know
    “I myself know”

(44) ca însuși tine (CT: 98)
    as self-3rd.SG you-ACC
    “as you yourself”

(45) însăși cuvintele acestea …
    themselves-FEM.SG words-FEM.PL the-FEM./PL these-FEM.PL
    “these words by themselves…”.

Consequently însuși tends to be replaced by other expressions capable of denying an expectation of non-identity, such as singur “alone”, “he and nobody else” (<Lat. singulus-) or the confirmation adverbial chiar (<Lat. claru- “[it is] clear [that]”), “even”.

### 3.3 Adjectival SINGUR “alone”

The core meaning of singur (cf. Lat. singulus) carries a conventional implicature denying the expectation that an additional participant could be involved in the event, confirming the fact that the given participant and nobody else should be considered for the argument in question. Such a pragmatic value is close enough to the one carried by însuși,
which confirms the fact that the predicate applies to two coreferential arguments, excluding any other argument. It is thus explicable that in contexts such as (46) – (48), singur is synonymous with însuși. As such, singur may be found already in old texts as a subject emphatic pronoun and as a modifier of either a personal pronoun or a noun:

(i) as a subject pronoun:

(46) Cumă singură grăiaște (Înv.: 513)
   As alone says
   “As he himself says”

(ii) following a personal pronoun:

(47) să ducă el singur pre feciorul lui Vasilie vodă în scaunul
   that take he himself on son.the of Vasilie king to throne.the
   Țării Muntenești (Costin: 89)
   Country-GEN Muntenia-GEN.
   “to take himself King Vasilie’s son to the throne of the Country of Muntenia”

(iii) preceding a noun:

(48) Și încă singură Hristos grăiaște (Înv.: 535)
   and also alone Christ says
   “and also Christ himself says [it]”

In contemporary Romanian, when it functions as a subject, singur is preferred to însuși.

(49) e un om simplu, singur spune, dragă,
   is.he a man simple, alone says.he, dear,
 mie mi-a plăcut mult mai mult în viață paharul decât carte (GA: VP: 160). in my life, I liked more the glass than the book.
“he is a simple man, even he says so, my dear [man], in my life, I preferred the glass (= drinking) to the book (= learning).”

In (50) singur replaces însuși after the personal subject pronoun ea:

(50) Și nu i-au mai făcut nimic, ce să-și mai facă dacă
And they didn’t do anything to her, what could they do if

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ea} & \quad \text{singură} & n & \quad \text{a fost} & \quad \text{în stare} \\
\text{she} & \quad \text{alone} & \quad \text{not} & \quad \text{has been} & \quad \text{capable} \\
\text{să-} & \quad \text{și} & \quad \text{vadă} & \quad \text{de} & \quad \text{capul ei} & \quad \text{(GA, DE:41)} \\
to & \quad \text{REFL-DAT} & \quad \text{take.care} & \quad \text{of} & \quad \text{head hers}
\end{align*}
\]

“And they didn’t do anything to her, what could they do if even she was not capable of taking care of herself”.

3.2.2. The adverbial chiar for însuși

Chiar originates in the adverbial use of the adjective (cf. Lat. clarum “clear”), with the meaning “(it is) clear (that P)”, as shown by its values in Old Romanian texts: “exactly, clearly, precisely, indeed, truly” (see Densusianu, 1961.2: 165) as well as by some of its contemporary contextual values (see (51)). It has a similar pragmatic function of an emphatic pronoun in the sense that it serves as a marker confirming the truth-value of an utterance referring to an unexpected quality or event.

(51) chiar că- i prost!

clear that is.he stupid

“[it is] clear that he is stupid!”.

In (51), chiar serves to deny the expectation that “he is not that stupid”. The replacement of însuși by chiar is explicable in pragmatic
terms, since, in combination with an NP, they may carry a similar conventional implicature that confirms the fact that the predicate applies to an unexpected candidate for the referent of the modified constituent. As examples (52) and (53) show, according to our common beliefs, the “queen” is an unlikely candidate for the argument of the verb “to meet in a coffee shop in Davis”:

(52) s’a întîlnit \(\{\begin{array}{l}
a. \text{ cu însăși regina/ intr’o cafenea din Davis} \\
b. \text{ cu regina însăși}
\end{array}\} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{with herself queen/} \\
\text{with queen herself}
\end{align*}

“he met (a), (b) the queen herself in a coffee shop in Davis.”

(53) s’ a întîlni chiar cu regina într’o cafenea din Davis

REFL has met even with queen-the in a coffee shop from Davis

“he met even the queen in a coffee shop in Davis”.

Conclusions

The theoretical interest of the history of the Romanian emphatic pronouns is two-fold:

1. The cyclic evolution of the emphatic pronouns in Romanian shows how homonymic clashes contribute to the loss of an entire morphemic paradigm and how, thanks to shared pragmatic features (means of denial, confirmation of coreferentiality), new analytical expressions may replace the old forms that become less appropriate for carrying the implicature in question.

2. In agreement with the extended model of prototypical semantics, the split evolution of the reflexive dative pronouns provides interesting evidence for diachronic semantic reconstruction on the basis of attested synchronic variants.

Notes
1. In morpheme-by-morpheme translations we have used the following abbreviations: ACC: accusative, DAT: dative, FEM: feminine, GEN: genitive, IMPF: imperfect, MASC: masculine, MID: middle voice, REFL: reflexive, SUBJ: subjunctive.
2. For the pragmatic function of the emphatic pronouns defined as a means of denying an expected nonidentity or, in other words, a means of confirming an unexpected identity, see Lakoff 1971, Edmonson & Plank 1978, Martin, 1983, Ducrot 1980, Manoliu 1994.
3. For the pragmatic functions of the pronouns of identity Fr. même, Rom. același “same” see Martin 1975 and Manoliu 1997.
4. Cf. It. si lava le mani; Fr. il se lave les mains, Sp. se lava las manos, etc. “he/she washes his/her hands”.
5. For more details concerning the evolution of ipse and other demonstratives in V. Lat., see Abel, 1971.
7. The already compound form dînsul (de “from” + insu + l “the”) is rather frequent, especially in Moldavian texts, where it tends to replace the personal pronoun el (< Lat. illē). Nowadays dînsul is considered as a more polite variant of the personal pronoun el (<Lat. illu), especially in Muntenia.
8. According to Gheție (ed. 1997: 329), examples of the use of chiar instead of însuși can be found even in Old Romanian texts.
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